

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 20 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over Applicant's previously issued U.S. Pat. No. 6,712,320, in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,481,673 to Roe et. al., and alternatively in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,678,609 to Washburn.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 5-10 as depending from rejected base claims, but indicated that the claims would be otherwise allowable.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 11-19 were in condition for allowance.

In the present Office Action, objected to the specification, to wit, the presence of two informalities in the specification.

Applicant hereby responds to the Examiner's objections and rejections as described below.

A. Correction of Specification

Applicant has herein amended the specification to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner.

B. Rejection of Claims 1-4 and 20

In the present Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 20 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over Applicant's previously issued U.S. Pat. No. 6,712,320, in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,481,673 to Roe

et. al., and in view of U.S.Pat. No. 5,678,609 to Washburn. Without conceding to the characterization, Applicant has herein cancelled the identified claims in order to allow the presently allowable claims to issue. Applicant reserves the right to refile the presently cancelled claims in a separate application.

C. Objection to Claims 5-10

In the present Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 5-10 as depending from rejected base claims, but indicated that these claims were otherwise allowable. Applicant herein has amended these claims to remove the dependencies from rejected claims, and accordingly Applicant believes the claims are presently in condition for allowance.

D. Fees

The present application, as amended, includes three independent claims, and fifteen total claims. Accordingly, no additional claims fees are believed due.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests the issuance of a Notice Of Allowance for claims 5-19 at the earliest possible time. Applicant further respectfully request the courtesy of a telephone call should there be any outstanding issues related to the issuance of a Notice of Allowance in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,



Carl H. Pierce
Reg. No. 45,730
Reed Smith LLP
2500 One Liberty Place
1650 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7301
(215) 241-7970

Dated: December 28, 2005